The Report Committee for Andrew Emil Gansky
Certifies that this is the approved version of the following report:

Alluring Decay, Disquieting Beauty: Andrew Moore's Detroit Photographs

APPROVED BY
SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:

Supervisor: _____
Steven Hoelscher

_____
Randolph Lewis

Alluring Decay, Disquieting Beauty: Andrew Moore's Detroit Photographs

by

Andrew Emil Gansky, B.A.

Report

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2012

Abstract

Alluring Decay, Disquieting Beauty: Andrew Moore's Detroit Photographs

by

Andrew Emil Gansky, M.A.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2012

SUPERVISOR: Steven Hoelscher

Andrew Moore's series of photographs, *Detroit Disassembled* (2010), debuted in the United States in the midst of an escalating recession, mortgage and foreclosure crisis, and political fallout from federally-backed bank and automaker bailouts. Due to their subject matter, a number of viewers have interpreted the photographs as apt visualizations of contemporary crises. The photos depict the ruins of a cityscape scarred by decades of deindustrialization, economic decline, and significant outmigration. Shown in galleries, museums, on the Web, and published in a popular photo book, Moore's images have circulated relatively widely. Viewers have responded to the photos through a variety of media outlets, and their impressions of the images have been melancholic, visceral, distressed, and deeply uncertain. Some viewers have attacked Moore for exploiting and aestheticizing Detroit's suffering, others have perceived the images as a disturbing commentary on the state of the nation, and many have found the images beautiful, if desolate. The tensions between viewer responses, carrying the inflections of contemporary concerns, provide a valuable snapshot of how Moore's photographs of Detroit have furnished a

flashpoint and modulated a public discourse encompassing a number of interconnected apprehensions about the economy, deindustrialization, the environment, and social responsibility. However, Detroit's protracted experience of decline and abandonment has made the intersection of aesthetics and urban politics in Moore's photographs particularly controversial and troubling for some viewers. Because photographs are only partial glimpses of social and spatial phenomena, Moore's images have proven versatile in their ability to distill and illustrate multifarious viewer concerns.

Table of Contents

List of Figures

Introduction:
A Fecund Source of Uncertainty

Photographs pervade contemporary visual culture in instances remarkable and utterly banal—they continue to fill magazines, newspapers, and books; professional prints occupy the walls of galleries and museums and eventually filter into private collections; their visual surfaces scatter digitally across websites, blogs, social networks, electronic news publications, and photo-sharing platforms such as Flickr and Tumblr; they end up in shoe boxes, in personal albums, for resale in vintage stores, and every so often come to rest in archives as part of an institutionalized historical memory; they find employment as advertisements for food, clothes, furniture, cars, and tourist destinations. This list surely cannot capture photographs' ubiquity across material and digital platforms or their trajectories through time and space. Yet some images manage to exceed the background hum of photographic saturation and become objects of extended public concern. Why do viewers see particular photographs as worthy of concerted attention? What aspects of the images' content or form incites prolonged engagement? How do historical, cultural, aesthetic, or geographic contexts inflect their circulation?

Contemporary photographer Andrew Moore's series of images, *Detroit Disassembled* (2010), provides a key example to explore some of these questions. The photographs have circulated relatively widely, first appearing in process at the

Yancey Richardson Gallery in New York City before exhibition as a completed series in Ohio at the Akron Art Museum in 2010, subsequently printed in a popular photo book, and finally through various digital outlets, acquiring along the way a significant number of viewer responses recorded in reviews, news features, opinion essays, blogs, and TV spots and interviews. The photographs broadly survey Detroit, a U.S. city that has suffered from entanglements of economic decline, deindustrialization, outmigration, and thorny racial politics for more than fifty years. Moore focuses on the physical and material fallout of these historical trends, picturing abandoned homes, crumbling schools, the rusting hulks of factories, and the disconcerting juxtapositions of such ruins with a scattering of well-maintained and modern urban architecture. Although Moore's images of a decaying Detroit testify compellingly to the city's troubled history, viewer responses suggest that much more is at stake in the photographs than the conditions of this uniquely ravaged U.S. city. Viewers have used Moore's photographs to define Detroit as an allegory or symbol for a range of developing crises not exclusive to the city, including interrelated fears about the state of the U.S. economy, environmental degradation, and the social costs of deindustrialization. Although the viewers who are central to this analysis are not representative of every person who may have encountered Moore's work, their voices come through a significant range of media, including such national publications as the *New York Times*, *Wall Street Journal*, *The New Yorker*, *Time* magazine, and *The New Republic*, and from a variety of subject positions,

including university professors and bloggers who live in Detroit; geographically dispersed art critics, essayists, and journalists; and commentators on TV programs such as PBS *NewsHour* or internet publications such as the *World Socialist Web Site*. These viewers provide a range of conflicting opinions and arguments, helping fuel a somewhat controversial discourse around *Detroit Disassembled* that links artistic considerations with the troubling condition of a major U.S. urban area.

Detroit's experience of disaster deserves some introductory comments. A March 22, 2011, *New York Times* article, "Detroit Census Confirms a Desertion Like No Other," describes a recent wave of outmigration and introduces a complicated narrative of urban abandonment: "census data…show[s] that Detroit's population ha[s] plunged by 25 percent over the last decade," providing "dramatic testimony to the crumbling industrial base of the Midwest, black flight to the suburbs and the tenuous future of what was once a thriving metropolis" (Seelye 2011). Deindustrialization and race emerge as related terms in Detroit's decline—the article notes that earlier waves of outmigration left central Detroit predominantly black and surrounding suburbs almost exclusively white, but that Detroit's black residents are now finding it increasingly untenable to remain in a city with persistently scarce jobs (Seelye 2011). Kate Linebaugh (2011), writing on the same census data for the *Wall Street Journal*, establishes that the approximately 237,000 residents who recently abandoned Detroit left under duress and lost much in their flight, especially homes—between 2000 and 2010, the "number of vacant housing units doubled…to nearly

80,000" (Linebaugh 2011). Although the most recent exodus from the city is indeed precipitous, the scars of the urban landscape cut much deeper into Detroit's past, slicing into the politics and economics that impoverished and segregated the city in the midst of extensive deindustrialization.

In *The Origins of the Urban Crisis*, Thomas Sugrue (1996) has authoritatively established the roots of Detroit's abandonment in a confluence of discriminatory corporate policies and housing segregation, longstanding racial tensions, and the early stirrings of postindustrialism in the 1950s. During this period, auto manufacturers and supporting industries, which employed hundreds of thousands of Detroit workers, began to combat in earnest militant Detroit unions. They embarked on massive restructuring campaigns that gutted the central city and consolidated the U.S. car industry to the "Big Three": Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler. As a primary example of industrial disinvestment, Sugrue takes the faltering Packard Motors corporation, "which cut employment in its Detroit plant from 16,000 to 4,000 between 1952 and 1956" before shutting down entirely soon after (1996: 136). This factory's closure was emblematic of the city's mid-century crisis, which had eliminated 134,000 manufacturing jobs by 1963 (Sugrue 1996: 136). From its earliest stages, Detroit's "deindustrialization weighed most heavily on the job opportunities of young African American men," as white Detroiters were more often able to leave the city for surrounding suburbs with intensely discriminatory housing policies (Sugrue 1996: 147). Black residents therefore bore the brunt of mid-century

deindustrialization and unemployment in an increasingly segregated city that they could leave only with great difficulty. The persistent vacancy of industrial complexes and homes across the city therefore potentially signifies an unsavory history of racism and impoverishment, a subject of understandable sensitivity for photographers who work with such sites for whatever reason.

This history provides one way to contextualize Moore's photographs of ruins, but recent viewer responses have proven much more unruly, referencing a variety of crises past and present, real and imagined. Deirdre Foley-Mendelssohn (2010), of *The New Yorker*, writes, "[Moore's] pictures depict a ghost town, reminiscent of Robert Polidori's images of Chernobyl," linking up fears of social, urban, and environmental degradation. David St.-Lascaux (2011) says the "photos eerily evoke *A Clockwork Orange* junkscape of post-civilizational collapse," extrapolating violent social catastrophe from the city's photographed landscape. William Myers (2009), in a review for the *Wall Street Journal*, extracts a similarly bald criticism of the city from Moore's images: "Detroit is a social, political and economic wasteland." Mike Rubin (2011), writing for the *New York Times*, says Moore's pictures give the city "an eerie, postapocalyptic feel," suggesting the city is already dead, past saving. Yet Deirdre Hering (2009), in a piece for *The L Magazine* in Brooklyn, asserts that *Detroit Disassembled* "conveys that a depressed economy and the ravages of time have reduced what were once Detroit's symbols of prosperity into an ominous prophecy for the country's future," suggesting that if Detroit has suffered the apocalypse,

viewers are perhaps not far removed from experiencing such cataclysm in the near future. This grim litany indexes a range of concerns, including a degraded environment, defunct economic ideologies, the large-scale collapse of social relationships, the dissolution of the nation, and relative disbelief that the future offers any hope of improvement. That none of these reviews emphasize the connection between race and ruin suggests that contemporary viewers have tended to regard racism as an insufficient narrative to explain the degree of Detroit's dissolution, which implies that no single, historically situated narrative of crisis overdetermines reactions to the photographs. Instead, viewers perceive a surfeit of disasters, each vying for attention.

The preceding statements verge on the hyperbolic, but if such apocalyptic sensations are a relatively common response to *Detroit Disassembled*, these viewer expressions provide insights into the kinds of negotiations taking place around the images. Clearly, if Moore's photographs only invited despair, there would not be much point in looking—there would be little room for viewers to respond thoughtfully or imaginatively. Detroit's ruins, although clearly unsettling to many viewers, do not disclose only utter cataclysm, particularly when the ruins may emblematize the decay of troubled economic, political, or cultural structures. For example, Max Kozloff (2011) expresses ambivalence about the systems or ideologies that seem threatened in Detroit, such as industrial capitalism: "Once thought expandable without limit, the systems of industrialism, transport, alimentation and

power—all interconnected—are sapping the earth of the very resources needed to run them." However, Kozloff's response to *Detroit Disassembled* is relatively abstract—he sees the photographs as a comment on a confluence of structural factors rather than a personalized human tragedy. Noreen Malone (2011), writing for *The New Republic*, attacks the photographs' for inciting such responses: "Without people in them, these pictures don't demand as much of the viewer, exacting from her [an] engagement…on a purely aesthetic level." Yet Kozloff's impressions are hardly a matter of simple aesthetics—he expresses profound anxiety about the immense scope of the problems facing Detroit and, indeed, any person dependent upon the same technological or political forces that have failed to sustain the city. Even so, the curators of *Detroit Disassembled* at the Akron Art Museum assert that "[f]rom destruction and decay, [Moore] has wrought images of great visual beauty" (Tannenbaum and Kahan 2010: 123). Other viewers, including the editors of *The Architect's Newspaper*, have described the images as "a tragic yet beautiful glimpse into the decline of a city that was once the twentieth century industrial heart of America" ("On View" 2011). These statements get at an underlying tension in the photographs: they are, to some viewers, beautiful images, yet their subject matter is distressing. How can viewers resolve the human suffering suggested by the city's cataclysmic appearance and the aesthetic pleasures that some have felt in response to Moore's images?

Uncertainties abound, about what the photographs show, how viewers should

respond, and what the future of Detroit might look like. Jörg Colberg (2010) offers a productively perplexed reading: he says, "[*Detroit Disassembled*] feels a bit unfinished for me, and I'm using the word 'feels' because even though I've thought about it for a while I can't pin down what it is." Although Colberg means the comment as a criticism, he indicates the open-endedness of the photographs—the images are complex formal documents that approach unsettling subjects, and are not easily pinned to a single reading or constrained to narrow arguments. Perhaps more important, though, is Colberg's intimation that the photographs have slowed him down, and that even after an extended engagement with the images, he remains uncertain about his ability to discern what the photographs mean. This is just one reading amongst many, but the photographs' capacity to slow down viewers and cultivate uncertainty is worth exploring. At stake is what kind of politics may take root when viewers do not know what to say, when they hesitate, unsure of how to (re)act. The disquiet that has coagulated around *Detroit Disassembled* urges an investigation as to the tenor of uncertainties about Moore's photographs—what do uneasily apocalyptic responses to the photographs reveal about viewers' political complaints, cultural dissatisfactions, or aspirations? Turning to the formal qualities of Moore's photographs elucidates how the images cultivate doubt, and a fuller exploration of viewer responses suggests a relationship between viewer uncertainties and how viewers express their politics.

Chapter 1:
Photographing Layers of History

A survey of Andrew Moore's photography reveals an artist deeply engaged with human places uniquely marked, transformed, or ravaged by history: Cuba, Russia, Vietnam, and Bosnia; defunct military installations on Governors Island, New York; a rapidly industrializing China; and most recently, Detroit. Moore is perhaps best understood as a photographer who develops portraits of places at particular moments in time, bringing into focus especially those spaces and situations that bespeak a layering of history, rife with contrasts between original intentions and uses, subsequent economic or militant devastation, and the adaptations or abandonments of human occupants. His singular engagement with architectural spaces has relatively deep personal roots; in an interview, he described to me how his father, an architect, would often take the family to sites under construction and narrate the eventual layout of the building. As Moore relates these experiences to his photography,

> I became used to imagining spaces and their functions without much in the way of tangible evidence. I believe this exercise in mental "blue printing" played a vital role as I started to photograph architectural forms, because the way I perceived structures wasn't that they contained, or constrained space, but rather that that they animated and brought those spaces to life. Indeed one of the very first things I consider when making a photograph is how alive the space is, how articulated it is, and how I can define, mold and frame that space within the picture plane. (2011, pers. comm., Feb 19)

Although Moore's eye is therefore more attuned to spatial compositions than

portraits of people, he displays an extremely canny sense of how to work with spaces as social phenomena, of finding the moments and angles that capture the physical traces of human actions, if not people themselves. Moore's photographs find their richest ground by amassing such human evidence in the frame, but leaving much uncertain about the processes of accumulation—there is rarely a clear sense of cause and effect in his images. Eerily evacuated yet engrossing places haunt Moore's photographs—places themselves haunted by the spectral detritus of activity, from the human effects of vandalism, bombs, and industry, to the nonhuman effects of ice, wind, and plant life.

These haunted places are especially in evidence in *Detroit Disassembled*. Perhaps more than any of Moore's other photographs, his Detroit images display places with fading social currency, their original meaningfulness deteriorating in the face of wide-scale abandonment and economic devaluation. The human lives that these spaces reflect are sometimes difficult to recognize or discern—the burned out husks of homes and nightclubs or the liquefying pulp of schoolbooks seem to testify to a troubling lack of human inhabitance, yet the trees Andrew Moore finds growing out of rotting books or in the midst of collapsed buildings suggest the strange uses the spaces have found after human abandonment. The photographs record the uncanny traces of residual human endeavors and the augmentation of these spaces by nonhuman actors—fire, weeds, and weather partially rewrite the forsaken buildings of Detroit. Barbara Maria Stafford (2000) has written compellingly on modern

viewers' unsettled attraction to ruined structures. She describes ruins as doubly unstable because they are "unmoored from the past and, hence…illegible or extinguished from human memory; and second, because they are grotesque, that is, not possessing a preestablished formal and rational connotation," yet due to their subversion of order, ruins "are open to constant interpretation" (Stafford 2000: 74). Whereas ruins disclose the insuperably "fragmentary" nature of historical memory and support a "theory that all contemporary phenomena are broken wholes," a viewer's ability to tell new stories about ruins, or Detroit, is never foreclosed—ruins challenge the ability to make stable meanings and put to rest all doubts about what has happened, why such destruction exists (Stafford 2000: 77).

A sense of illegibility or compromised legibility is likewise important to viewers' ability to engage with photographs. A number of writers have theorized the essentially uncertain relationships between photographs and codified meaning. Jacques Rancière (2007) deftly describes photos' uncooperative dual nature: they provide "the legible testimony of a history written on faces or objects," but also consist of "pure blocs of visibility, impervious to any narrativization, any intersection of meaning" (11). Rancière may slightly overstate the case—it seems more accurate to say that photographs resist narrative calcification, or in Ariella Azoulay's (2008) words, claims to ownership over the image: "The photograph is out there, an object in the world, and anyone, always (at least in principle), can pull at one of its threads and trace it in such a way as to reopen the image and renegotiate what it shows"

(13). The photographer Frank Gohlke (2009) offers a particularly evocative description of a photograph as

> the integument surrounding a set of appearances with the potential for significant connections outward along many axes. To see photographs in this way requires more from the viewer, but the rewards are great. The difference is like that between the microscope slide and the living cell, between learning about a thing through its structure and understanding it through its interactions with other organisms. (191)

This last statement is especially good to consider when approaching Moore's photographs, which are, above all else, scenes of interactions that have coalesced visibly in space—interactions between people, architecture, nature, and history. In this, Moore's attention to built form befits his exemplary approach to Detroit's spaces. Photographs of ruins suggest an aggregation of uncertainties, about what the ruins might signify and how the photographs arrange the legibility of ruins as "a set of appearances" that are always in potentia, available for viewers to supply imaginative connections and associations. The meanings thus established are contingent, subject to revision or challenge upon subsequent viewings or by other viewers. This helps account for the imaginative and allusive comparisons viewers have drawn from Moore's pictures to fictional films, such as *A Clockwork Orange* (St.-Lascaux 2011), and to disasters with entirely separate historical circumstances, such as Chernobyl (Foley-Mendelssohn 2010). Such connections between the photographs and seemingly unrelated events do not reveal that Moore's photographs are ahistorical and encourage ahistorical readings, but rather the difficulties these two viewers have describing the extent of Detroit's decay. Nor should we miss the

eminently political undertones of these two references: to states unable to care for or protect their citizens, to the dissolution of social bonds, and to a human-made disaster which no human technology or effort can fix.

Although the photographic form does seem especially available to such readings, the question remains how or why Moore's particular photographs may be instrumental to this current strain of discourse about Detroit and disaster. They are certainly not the only contemporary photographs of the city's ruins. In the mid-1990s, Camilo José Vergara began photographing the city's ruins, and even created something of a scandal when he proposed to transform twelve downtown blocks into a ruins preserve (Bennet 1995). More recently, Magnum photographer Alec Soth (2009) published pictures of Detroit's abandoned buildings in the UK newspaper *The Telegraph*, and the photojournalist Ryan Spencer Reed (2011) composed a short selection of similar images under the title "Detroit Forsaken" for *Photo Technique*. In addition, the two French photographers who originally encouraged Moore to visit Detroit, Romain Meffre and Yves Marchand (2011), released *The Ruins of Detroit*, an extensive photo book that visits several of the same sites pictured in *Detroit Disassembled*. Locals and tourists have likewise driven Detroit's photographic presence, especially on dedicated websites such as *The Fabulous Ruins of Detroit* (n.d.), or platforms such as Flickr, which boasts more than 133,000 tagged photos of the abandoned Michigan Central Station alone, in addition to a plethora of images of other abandoned sites. Beyond these ruins-centric efforts, Magnum photographer

Bruce Gilden (2008) created a photo essay, "Detroit: The Troubled City," which combines affecting images and audio of Detroit residents facing foreclosure. Yet Moore has arguably enjoyed a greater deal of attention (and scrutiny) than his contemporaries; in addition to scathing and laudatory reviews, his book *Detroit Disassembled* was one of the *New York Times*' top picks for its 2010 holiday gift guide, and *Time* magazine included one Detroit image in "The Year in Pictures 2009." Moore suggests his photographs debuted at a fortuitous moment, as the national recession and foreclosure crisis escalated, and his established position as an art photographer has certainly helped his images' circulation (2011, pers. comm., Feb 19). Yet Moore's style of photography lends to an especially complicated sense of legibility, in terms of the extraordinary amount of detail contained in many of his frames, and in his engaging inclusions of found text. These formal qualities arguably provide for rich, multivalent readings, as well as passionate contestations over the images' meaning(s).

To make his photographs, Moore uses large cameras, typically an 8x10-inch view camera, and in some situations, a slightly more mobile and versatile 4x5-inch view camera. These cameras' photographic plates require extended exposures, sometimes a half-minute or more, especially in the dimly illuminated interiors of abandoned structures. Their large size and slow exposure speeds require Moore, and sometimes an assistant, to set up each shot on a tripod and to thoroughly account for the photographed space to discern uneven lighting conditions. What this process

lacks in mobility, it compensates in the ability to gather and compose a surfeit of details, textures, and information in the photographic frame with incredible resolving power. Just as Moore must dig into spaces to craft the best possible photograph, his images give the eye much to dig into, especially when viewers encounter the photographs in museum or gallery contexts, where the largest exhibited prints are up to 62x78 inches. As one viewer comments, "you feel you can almost step into" the photographs (Fiorelli 2011). Unlike some photojournalists or snapshooters, who move quickly within moments to arrest briefly constituted and rapidly evolving scenes, Moore works less with a sense of temporal contingency than a notion of temporal layering. The photographs in *Detroit Disassembled* are not fleeting glimpses of passing phenomena, but extended gazes into complicated spaces that bear testimony to the uneven, scarring passage of time. Moore employs juxtapositions and accumulates visual elements to suggest the traces of historical developments that do not necessarily add up. The spaces of his photographs are lively, and details filter into the frame like fine silt, awaiting an attentive eye to excavate them.

Some of the most important details Moore collects are what Philip Levine (2010) calls "found poems," a phrase that nicely captures the multivalent nature of the words that Moore discovers graffitied on walls, displayed on billboards, imprinted on products, or otherwise marking the spaces of Detroit (115). These words quite literally allow viewers to read many of Moore's photographs, yet the words often reflect the purposes spaces served before they were abandoned, or

otherwise juxtapose discordantly with the environments where they are situated. Expanding Levine's terminology, the presence of these words lend to what might be called a poetics of uncertainty, a paratactic arrangement of words and spaces. The effects of Moore's compositions can be jarring, and uncertainty can be disorienting, discomfiting. However, inasmuch as discomfort can produce movement, a rearrangement of positions or thoughts, it can create space for viewer negotiations. To apprehend the processes of viewer negotiation, I offer readings of three photographs from *Detroit Disassembled*, interwoven with the words of other viewers. By juxtaposing images, impressions, criticisms, and doubts, I hope to tease out how the photographs have emerged as an object of concern, as well as the justifications, arguments, and goals of a political discourse constituted around a set of images.

Chapter 2:
On Detroit Time

John Patrick Leary (2011), a faculty member at Wayne State University in Detroit, has been one of *Detroit Disassembled*'s sharpest critics. He insists the photographs "present no way to understand our own relationship to the decline we are seeing," and that Moore's treatment of "ruin[s] make them pictures of nothing and no place in particular," at the same time "instantly familiar and utterly vague" (Leary 2011). These sentiments are worth parsing. Leary is displeased that Moore's photographs are not definitive statements that strive for a predetermined or codified response from viewers, yet his insistence that viewers can be "instantly familiar" with "nothing and no place" muddies the waters. How can a viewer recognize ruins (vaguely), and yet have no relationship to ruin? What would allow viewers to identify with something of which they have no understanding? Leary himself offers a contradictory suggestion: Detroit is "a condensed, emphatic example of the trials of so many American cities in an era of globalization" (2011). By this reasoning, U.S. viewers, at least, will have some experience with ruin, whether they have lived in or even passed through a hard-hit urban area. It is, of course, the nature of that experience that is at stake, and how viewers frame their relation to ruins, whether as features of their home city, as repulsive sights, as emblems of American decline, a symptom of race relations, or an intimation of some other crisis. Rather than

providing absolutely no way to understand the relationship between viewers and Detroit, as Leary initially argues, his subsequent point intimates that the photographs can help viewers see Detroit as an emblem of larger political and economic realities. A review of *Detroit Disassembled* for the *Wall Street Journal* concurs: "Everybody knows what went wrong with Detroit because everybody sees in the city problems that trouble the rest of the country. Detroit serves as a metaphor for broader societal problems—it seems to register the ravages of civic decay like an urban Portrait of Dorian Gray" ("Photo-Op" 2012). A metaphorical connection may well be uncertain, but the *Wall Street Journal* description evocatively asserts that a failure to address what is happening in Detroit bespeaks a national inability to mitigate "civic decay." In metaphor, there is room to hash out the meanings of Detroit, to treat the relationship between viewers and ruin as in process rather than nonnegotiable.

But what are the particulars of this metaphoric vision—what tone do Moore's photographs strike? One of his images, *National Time clock, former Cass Technical High School building* (figure 1), is an apropos place to begin. In the image, a distended number twelve oozes toward an unreadable morass of digits. The molten beige upon which the numbers are printed drapes over the hands of the clock, its downward slide arrested. The plastic face has lifted in places, exposing a blued metal circle that contrasts subtly with the wall's charred black enamel. Just to right of the clock, the crackled paint has separated into layers, peeling off to reveal a patch of unsullied turquoise, a splotch of immaculate color that constantly vies for the eye's attention.

But the melted clock begs to be read, in spite of its many missing numbers. The time at which it stopped can be discerned, just a little past 3:50. The slender, red second hand points to the third tic mark after the numeral eight. A small line of text remains legible between the numeral six and the center of the clock: "NATIONAL TIME." A scorched wall, a disfigured clock, and a piece of text—a microscopic view that distills a city even as it gestures toward a national field of relations. Yet the allegory is unclear: has the onward flow of national time (an implicitly progressive notion) abandoned Detroit, or does Detroit indicate an interrupted national progress narrative?

Figure 1: *National Time clock, former Cass Technical High School building*
(Andrew Moore © 2010)

The clock, of course, is a mass-produced object. It symbolizes the national time of standardized products, and as a functional tool was once synchronized with the official time of the school, established on the basis of a national time zone. Clearly, time has not stopped in Detroit, only this timepiece, and yet the kind of time the clock used to measure is now apparently meaningless to the school. Why mark the hours when no bells will ring, no students will pass from class to class, and fires burn in vacant classrooms? Such a place is out of sync, or in the words of Jörg

Colberg (2009), "surreal": upon viewing the photograph of the clock, he muses, "Maybe this is all just a dream, and a country like the U.S. would not literally have one of its largest cities resemble a modern-day Pompeii?" For Colberg, then, the relationship to ruin is one of disbelief. The mangled clock suggests the need for the nation to reestablish its time, bring Detroit back into the fold of its standardized reality. But on what terms can the nation and Detroit reconnect? It is possible that national time, as emblematized by a flimsy, plastic, mass-produced, ubiquitous clock, is itself a kind of sickness, and its failure is "an object lesson in industrial capitalism, the ramifications of globalization, inhumanity and shortsightedness, and an urgent call to action to rethink consumerism" (St.-Lascaux 2011). In other words, the national time of which Detroit once partook, and indeed produced in its vast factories of consumable objects, *is* the root problem, not the solution. Although the abandoned Cass Technical High School is no longer significant to the national production of working subjects, it can serve as a space to negotiate the concept of national time—as an imposed, uniform experience, or as something else, defined in relation to Detroit's distinct situation.

As things stand, Detroit's current distinction is dubious. The possibilities of negotiations between city and nation, experience and ideology, are not easy or straightforward. Moore described to me the challenges of photographing schools like Cass, which he found to be profoundly "emotionally troubling" because they had been "violently degraded, trashed without thought, violated with anger and

abandon"; Moore asserts that he "had great trouble keeping [his] composure and balance" during extended engagements with such locations (2011, pers. comm., March 18). Of the Detroiters Moore spoke with he likewise insists, "to a person they all hated the abandoned buildings…. For them this was like a spreading cancer, and they wanted to see it cut out, to have all of it torn down and hauled away as quickly as possible" (2011, pers. comm., Feb 19). Yet he concludes, "I'm not sure if I really can understand the despair [Detroiters] must confront everyday," "living face to face with these destroyed icons of learning and community" (2011, pers. comm., March 18). These visceral reactions to the forsaken places of the city point to the fact that much more is at stake than metaphors and ideologies—the city's desertion and dissolution has had a profound emotional fallout that the passage of time has not made easier for residents to bear. In Max Kozloff's (2011) words about the photographs, it is difficult to look at places where "erstwhile belief systems ran out of time," and yet he senses "voluptuous disenchantment" in the images.

But isn't this just an art world trick, a transformation of raw pain into irony, of tangible politics into images and aesthetics? Sarah Cox (2011), writing for the website *Curbed Detroit*, appears to think so, asserting that "ruin porn is [a] color wheel seductress" for arts writers and aesthetes everywhere. The term "ruin porn" came to prominence in 2009 with Thomas Morton's contribution to *Vice* magazine, "Something, Something, Something, Detroit: Lazy Journalists Love Pictures of Abandoned Stuff," wherein he skewered a "plague" of photographers and journalists

who he argued "don't want anything to do with the city" except to exploit its condition for personal gain. Yet the *Curbed* family of sites, including New York, Atlanta, Boston, and San Francisco iterations, purports its mission is to "breathe life into real estate" and "relentlessly report on sales and rental prices, new developments, neighborhood trends, and celebrity deals," a baldly consumerist undertaking that would clearly have little interest in emotionally-charged ruins, which might, after all, bring down property values. Cox's deployment of an insider/outsider binary, which casts Moore as a "poster child" for New York-centrism, which only understands Detroit through "a New York comparison," is utterly surreal on a franchise website that maintains "a focus [on] all-things design, decor, and shelter, from Malibu dream houses to Wyoming ranches to Maine cabins, and all residences in between" (2012). But the bewildering juxtaposition of values—ruins, aesthetics, real estate—is worth considering. What scale exists to value a ruined midwestern high school vis-à-vis a posh California beach house? How might the forsaken places of Detroit contrast with *Curbed*'s glib use of the word "shelter"? And what does Cox's response to Moore, wrapped up in delocalized media, say about her position in political arrangements?

Another Moore photograph, *Metropolitan Building and Skyline, Downtown* (figure 2), may help unravel some of these questions. The photograph affords a lofty view of Detroit's urban core. Early dawn or late afternoon light imbues the structures in the frame with glowing faces of rose and pale caramel. Two statuesque skyscrapers

rise in the distance. An American flag, miniscule but proud, flies against a clear, slate blue sky. The stately architectural details of a tower's upper levels fill the foreground. Emblazoned shields and elegant stonework adorn the parapet of an elevated balcony, exemplifying the gothic revival, pre-Depression architecture that still composes much of Detroit's skyline. Most of the buildings visible in the frame are of masonry or brickwork construction, and the soft, even exposure of the lighting suggests an appreciation for the elegance of the structures. Yet the Metropolitan Building is no object of careful preservation. Dingy shards of glass hang from broken windowpanes, and in the gloom behind the parapet, stunted, half-dead saplings rise from the disused balcony. Sealant peels from between the stones, and a discarded beer bottle sits below one of the windows along with scattered pieces of trash. However, the building in the upper left quarter of the frame evinces an entirely different era and style of architecture. The structure is apparently occupied, but oblique, concrete, blank. This skyscraper bears an unsightly red billboard, marked by AT&T's corporate icon, an instantly recognizable blue- and

Figure 2: *Metropolitan Building and Skyline, Downtown* (Andrew Moore © 2010)

white-striped globe. A closer inspection rewards the viewer with the text of the advertisement: "AT&T works in more places, like NEW SANFRAKOTA."

The advertisement's butchered compression of place-names, "New Sanfrakota," contrasted with the crumbling architecture of the space it addresses, imparts *Metropolitan Building* with a profound sense of ironic play. The billboard, and the broader media network it represents, overlooks Detroit in more than one sense. Quite literally, the ad hails viewers from a position of extraordinary elevation, yet the elevated spot it faces—the upper floors of the decaying Metropolitan Building—are clearly abandoned. The photograph emphasizes the distance between the corporation and city, counterposing the vacated spaces of urban Detroit with a piece of media that seems blithely unaware of the condition of the city it addresses. Yet Detroit's condition, thanks to photography, circulates visually through precisely the media networks evoked in the AT&T advertisement. One reviewer argues there is a connection between the media that circulates Moore's photography and his "visual syntax, which is tainted with a commercialism most often associated with magazine assignments" (Radujko 2011). There are echoes of Cox's criticism: Moore is a professional photographer, not from Detroit, and therefore cannot approach the city except from a commercialized perspective. But such an argument twists the stakes. It transforms the issue into one of tastes and aesthetics—whether Moore's pictures are, in a sense, good enough: to accurately represent the experience of Detroiters, to not distort the city for non-Detroit viewers—indeed, to "educate the viewer" about

something more than the aesthetics of ruins (Radujko 2011). But what would an educational aesthetic look like? What photograph of Detroit could, in Radujko's words, change the minds of "voters and policymakers" in a predictable, dependable manner (2011)? That ideal photograph likely does not exist. Yet there is a discourse surrounding *Detroit Disassembled* not limited to the explicit content and form of the photographs—the images resonate on multiple registers.

What is at stake for some viewers is not the purported quality of Moore's Detroit images, but the city's condition and how the photographs make Detroit visible. The photographs have served as articulation points for diffuse political, social, or economic concerns that can move beyond a politics of the photograph. Some viewers connect Detroit's photographic appearance with political and cultural criticisms, drawing on visual content to establish Detroit's relevance to a larger public than photo critics. Viewers do more than simply consume the photographs—as David Novak (2010) has argued more broadly, "Contemporary subjects live much of their lives through media. They reappropriate received materials for widely divergent personal goals, and construct social relations through an intertextual discourse of mediated references" (41). Debates about Detroit photography cannot therefore transcend issues of mediation or aesthetics, but it is important to acknowledge and analyze the moments when viewers stop talking about the photographs explicitly and start talking about Detroit in order to understand how mediated relationship can give rise to politicized expressions.

To get at how viewers have reappropriated Moore's photographs to imagine their relationships with Detroit, it is germane to explore the contrast between the Metropolitan Building and the skyscraper behind the AT&T advertisement, to dig into how ruin appears in the photograph. Although the Metropolitan Building is clearly abandoned and has suffered at the hands of vandals or revelers, it hardly appears beyond repair, its solid construction essentially intact. The presence of the newer building behind the AT&T advertisement is therefore somewhat perplexing. When and why should it have been necessary to build new office space in a city that has been hemorrhaging population for more than sixty years? The Metropolitan Building's broken windows signify a disrespect that is not far removed from the initial disrespect of seemingly senseless abandonment in favor of slightly newer office space. Sharon Zukin (1993) argues that modern imaginings of progress are aptly summed by economist Joseph Schumpeter's evocative phrase "creative destruction," which roots future innovations and prosperity in the liquidation of past and present (4). This goes some distance towards explaining the apparent waste of an extant building in favor of something newer. But some viewers see Detroit as a place where the seams of ravenous modernity have come apart, evincing much destruction, but much less of the vaunted creative renewal. Tim Tower (2011), writing about Moore for the *World Socialist Web Site*, expresses dismay at "the historical forces which have been rending the city into smaller and smaller pieces," especially the most recent proposals of "right-sizing," which will destroy more of the city's structures and

possibly force residents of thinning neighborhoods to relocate, ostensibly to "fix…the city's structural budget problem." The appearance of newer structures is thereby gratuitous, constructed in the face of buildings the city is already unable to support. Any new construction thus seems, in all likelihood, already consigned to abandonment. According to Sarah Zabrodski (2012), Moore's photographs clearly "illustrate the essence of a culture of waste distilled into large scale buildings."

Such is the apparent case of a room in another one of Moore's photographs, *Abandoned videoconferencing room, Chase Tower, Financial District* (figure 3). In comparison to the rest of the series, *Abandoned videoconferencing room* at first seems somewhat out of place; the photograph contains no notable architectural details, no variegated expanses of rust, no invading foliage, no spectacle of decay. The image is, in fact, hopelessly banal: a room, gray walled, lit by rows of fluorescent lights, delimits the scene; rows of red office chairs and a bland oak table are the only characters. In the high center of the image, embossed in large letters on the far wall, the city's name stands out: "DETROIT." Upon the conference table in the foreground, a sparse tangle of electronics cables, a black office telephone, and some sundry documents provide minimal visual interest.

Figure 3: *Abandoned videoconferencing room, Chase Tower, Financial District* (Andrew Moore © 2010)

The technology is contemporary: a blue Ethernet cable lies on the table, unconnected to any computer, along with USB conference microphones, waiting for a meeting that will never transpire. It is an altogether bland space, unattractively lit and furnished, constructed with an indifference to style, decorated without a thought to the niceties of matching colors.

This room is also a kind of ruin, or at least a sign of waste, an abortive attempt to remake Detroit's economy in the context of post-industrialism. The city's name overlooks the conference room in an assertive typeface, but is this the future of Detroit? Simply more new structures that "*rise*," as Robert Smithson (1996) might say, "into ruin"? (72). Are such empty rooms "the monumental vacancies that define, without trying, the memory-traces of an abandoned set of futures"? (Smithson 1996: 72). Today, the abandoned videoconference room is perhaps finding some use again at the hands of new tenants: Quicken Loans purchased the building from Chase in 2011, moving some 2,300 workers to the tower downtown ("Quicken Loans" 2011). Yet David St.-Lascaux (2012), reviewing *Detroit Disassembled* for the *Brooklyn Rail*, dismisses such redevelopment; he compares Detroit's experiences at large to that of the "abandoned Domino Sugar factory, employing 4,500 at its peak, [which] awaits, perhaps, gentrification on the East River in Brooklyn. New York, we are cheerfully told, is now a *financial* center. *Resurget Cineribus*, my ass." Although he expresses some distaste for Moore's photographs, St.-Lascaux discerns vapidity in the promises of post-industrial renewal through other financial instruments—what

remains worth holding onto is that 4,500 workers had to lose their jobs to clear the way for something else—something new, if hardly better, for many viewers.

And so, St.-Lascaux draws a specific example to explain the relationship between himself and Detroit, seeing the city's troubles as an emblem of destructive trends observable in localities everywhere. Although some viewers may be uncertain about what the photographs say about Detroit's future, what exactly the pictures mean, or the quality of the images, they are able to use them to perceive how Detroit is relevant to a broader range of experiences. An *Art Daily* review likewise asserts that Moore's pictures are a "remind[er]…of the collapse of past civilizations, and [a] warn[ing] that contemporary empires," such as the United States, "risk the same fate" ("Detroit Disassembled" n.d.). Detroit time, then, is setting national time, an emblem of decay and dissolution, a grim symbol of things to come. Another commentator, Willy Staley (2011), imagines the connection somewhat differently. He asks viewers to "consider these photographs and stories a reminder that in America we actually do abandon our neighbors and let our cities die, time and time again" (Staley 2011). In all of these readings, loss is prominent, but Staley's wording is the starkest. His imagination of dissolving neighborly bonds re-localizes the pain of the city's protracted downfall in human relationships—a twinned loss for the forsaken and for involuntary deserters. Staley's words make the city's death harder to bear, and fundamentally inescapable—yet newer skyscrapers may rise in the place of the Metropolitan Building, and some economic resurrection may reanimate Detroit's

vast vacancy, but even in this best hope for the city's future, Detroit will not quite heal. The language of apocalypse, which at first blush may strike an overwrought tone, is perhaps an adequately affecting term to describe the falling apart of neighborhoods, of schools, of places of work and play—the scattering of memories and personal histories, which will never be reassembled.

Coda:
An Inhuman Future

Loss, desertion, ignominy, anger, anguish—if these are amongst the emotions that Moore's photographs evoke, why do viewers continue to look? To confirm their own despair? Why does the *New York Times* frame *Detroit Disassembled* as fitting holiday fare, appropriate to wrap in gleaming paper and bequeath amidst yuletide revelries? This is perhaps the most difficult aspect of Moore's picture to approach—their apparent ability to make the grimmest views of Detroit aesthetically alluring, and ultimately, gift-worthy. As one viewer says succinctly, "It was so sad to see, yet I found Moore's photos so beautiful it was hard to look away" ("Detroit Disassembled" 2012). Although some viewers engage the photographs to negotiate the political, cultural, and economic implications of Detroit's condition, almost every viewer comments on the aesthetic qualities of the photographs, whether to criticize Moore or acclaim his artistry. At times, viewers' appreciation of the photographs can seem to lose sight of the fact that for many Detroiters, there is little reason to look at the city as an aesthetic experience. For example, Douglas Max Utter (2010) celebrates *Detroit Disassembled* as a series of "subtly mind-bending images" that epitomize the "dramatic beauty and pictorial perfection of large-scale photographs." He elaborates, "Neither tragic, ironic, nor nostalgic, they take a long, very contemporary look at the way various types of degradation bring forth utterly

strange, transitional vistas" (Utter 2010). Not tragic, but strange; not nostalgic, but dramatic—degradation brings about uncertain, yet striking, transitions. Sad for some, surreal for others, but beautiful, even compelling—wherefore grandeur and allure out of the economic destruction of a city?

Robert Adams (1981), a photographer famous for his images of clear-cut forestry, suburban tract housing, and other human effects on the western U.S. landscape, offers the following sentiment in his writings on photography: "When we are young we want art that is filled with bitter facts, because we believe that evil can be overcome if we face it; when we grow older we begin to doubt this optimistic belief, we want art that does not simply reinforce the pain of our disillusionment" (74). The statement is both a subtle commentary on the efficacy of art to alter the ills of the world, but also on the need for art to exceed the mere reproduction of suffering. But how does art provide for something more, and whose desires are served by such artistic transformation? Andrew Moore describes the issue as a tension between two artistic "commitments," "art for art's sake" and "socially responsible art," which he asserts "can never be fully reconciled" (2011, pers. comm., Feb. 19). Yet in Detroit, which Moore calls an "intersection of the aesthetic and the political, a place where art meets anxiety," he thinks these two competing viewpoints are productive, giving art the critical edge to make a valuable contribution to discourses about the city (2011, pers. comm., Feb 19). Still, the terms are a bit slippery. It is not entirely clear to what aspect of the social Moore believes

artists are responsible, nor how to manage the intertwined affects of beauty and anxiety.

Philip Levine, in an essay for the book edition of *Detroit Disassembled*, cuts somewhat against the grain of many viewer responses to the photographs, and argues that the beauty and disillusionment in Moore's images contribute to something new. Levine grew up in Detroit, and worked, reluctantly, in some of the now-defunct factories that Moore has photographed. Looking at the images, he says, "their calm in the face of the ravages of man and nature confer an unexpected dignity upon the subjects of [Moore's] camera, the very dignity I had assumed daily life had robbed them of," and also, "Moore's photographs honor what is most ignored and despised among us" (Levine 2010: 117). Dignity for the despised is indeed a noble cause, and as Levine puts it, the photographs have allowed him to see that Detroit still matters, and that its story is not finished. And yet Levine must be counted amongst the many who have left Detroit, setting out for other parts in 1954. In this sense, the photographs make it possible to occupy the city once again, but only visually. The viewer eventually leaves the gallery, shuts the book, or navigates to another webpage. Perhaps Detroit appeared beautiful, honored, and sad to the viewer, and perhaps this mix of feelings remains uncertain, irresolvable. And yet, Levine notes the "tiny patches of grass and clover," "vivid and green" evidence of "a new growth" and that "the world doesn't quit," as though an implicit admission that humans cannot make Detroit right, that there is a profundity of human failure visible in the

cityscape, but that humans may not have the last word on the city's fate (2010: 114). Moore's photographs and their layering of history suggest the impossibility of cleanly walking away from Detroit's past. Even as those who still live in the city continue to disperse, their absence leaves a mark.

So, perhaps viewers leave Moore's *Detroit Disassembled* a little disillusioned about the human capacity to destroy and incapacity to put things back together again, but eerily heartened by the sights of new, green things growing where people used to live. It may be true, then, that Moore's photographs do not do much to shore up efforts to redevelop Detroit's downtown as a financial district, to increase revenues at the city's new national league sports stadiums, or the sell residential real estate. Indeed, they may make such attempts appear a little naïve, if not facile, because uncertainties remain for Detroit's future and what the photographs achieve. Some viewers will still insist that Moore has made the wrong images of Detroit and has tastelessly aestheticized the pain of city's inhabitants, but the photographs provide a flashpoint for a discourse that moves beyond images. Maybe other viewers see the world a little differently, with a somewhat altered awareness as to what it means to build something, a factory, a neighborhood, a friendship, and to abandon those things. No explicit political movement may be born of Moore's photographs, and perhaps no art can be an adequate riposte to the suffering of a city, but the images show clearly that things left behind do not simply fade away. The dominant impression viewers appear to have formed of Detroit from Moore's photos is that the

city is a concerted, discomfiting example of where things have gone wrong, plans have failed, and human decisions have been instrumental to the destruction of a human undertaking. Neither Andrew Moore, nor his viewers, can rewrite Detroit's history, but if the photographs can continue to arrest the attention of viewers such as Sarah Zabrodski, Jörg Colberg, David St.-Lascaux, Willy Staley, or Philip Levine, and cause them to question the pace of development and the onward rush of national time, then perhaps the photographs can help shift the meanings of progress and pose a challenge to "creative destruction," forestalling the processes whereby human endeavors rise, rapidly and inevitably, into ruin.

References

Adams, Robert. *Beauty in Photography*. New York: Aperture Foundation, 1981.

Azoulay, Ariella. 2008. *The Civil Contract of Photography*. New York: Zone Books.

Bennet, James. 1995. "A Tribute to Ruin Irks Detroit." *New York Times*, December 10. Accessed April 16, 2012. http://www.nytimes.com/1995/12/10/us/a-tribute-to-ruin-irks-detroit.html.

Colberg, Jörg. 2009. "Review: Andrew Moore's Detroit at Yancey Richardson." *Conscientious*, November 17. Accessed April 20, 2012. http://jmcolberg.com/weblog/2009/11/review_andrew_moores_detroit_at_yancey_richardson/.

———. 2010. "Review: Detroit Disassembled by Andrew Moore." *Conscientious*, February 26. Accessed February 25, 2012. http://jmcolberg.com/weblog/2010/02/review_detroit_disassembled_by_andrew_moore/.

Cox, Sarah. 2011. "The New York Times Oggles Detroit Decay at Queens Art Museum." *Curbed Detroit*, September 20. Accessed April 16, 2012. http://detroit.curbed.com/archives/2011/09/the-new-york-times-oggles-detroit-decay-at-queen-art-museum.php#more.

"Detroit Disassembled by Andrew Moore." 2012. *One Twenty Five*, January 9. Accessed April 18, 2012. http://one-twenty-five.tumblr.com/post/15574938362/detroit-disassembled-by-andrew-moore-as-much-as.

"Detroit Disassembled: Photographs by Andrew Moore at the Akron Art Museum." n.d. *ArtDaily.org*. Accessed April 20, 2012. http://www.artdaily.com/index.asp?int_sec=11&int_new=38549&int_modo=1.

Fiorelli, Lauren. 2011. "Photographer Captures 'Detroit Disassembled.'" *The Colby Echo*, September 20. Accessed April 17, 2012. http://www.thecolbyecho.com/ae/photographer-captures-detroit-disassembled.

Foley-Mendelssohn, Deirdre. 2010. "American Ruins." *The New Yorker*, March 3. Accessed March 23, 2012. http://www.newyorker.com/online/blogs/books/2010/03/american-ruins.html.

Gilden, Bruce. 2008. "Detroit: The Troubled City." *Magnum in Motion*. Accessed April 20, 2012. http://inmotion.magnumphotos.com/essay/detroit-troubled-city.

Gohlke, Frank. 2009. *Thoughts on Landscape: Collected Writings and Interviews*. Tucson, Arizona: Hol Art Books.

Hering, Deirdre. 2009. "Andrew Moore's Beautiful Ruins." *The L Magazine*, November 22. Accessed March 23, 2012. http://www.thelmagazine.com/newyork/andrew-moores-beautiful-ruins/Content?oid=1407734.

Kozloff, Max. 2011. "A Planet of Relics." *Art in America*, January 4. Accessed March 23, 2012. http://www.artinamericamagazine.com/features/a-planet-of-relics/.

Leary, John Patrick. 2011. "Detroitism." *Guernica*, January. Accessed March 1, 2012. http://www.guernicamag.com/features/2281/leary_1_15_11/.

Levine, Philip. 2010. "Nobody's Detroit." In *Detroit Disassembled*, by Andrew Moore, 111-117. Akron, OH; Bologna, Italy: Akron Art Museum and Damiani Editore.

Linebaugh, Kate. 2011. "Detroit's Population Crashes: Census Finds 25% Plunge as Blacks Flee to Suburbs; Shocked Mayor Seeks Recount." *Wall Street Journal*, March 23. Accessed April 4, 2012. http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704461304576216850733151470.html.

Malone, Noreen. 2011. "The Case Against Economic Disaster Porn: Stop Slobbering Over Abandoned Cityscapes!" *The New Republic*, January 22. http://www.tnr.com/article/metro-policy/81954/Detroit-economic-disaster-porn.

Marchand, Yves, and Romain Meffre. 2011. *The Ruins of Detroit*. Göttingen, Germany: Steidl.

Meyers, William. 2009. "Ruins of a Once-Great City." *The Wall Street Journal*, November 21. Accessed March 23, 2012. http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704431804574539864087470216.html.

Moore, Andrew. 2010. *Detroit Disassembled*. Akron, OH; Bologna, Italy: Akron Art Museum and Damiani Editore.

Morton, Thomas. 2009. "Something, Something, Something, Detroit: Lazy Journalists Love Pictures of Abandoned Stuff." *Vice*, August. Accessed March 26, 2012. http://www.viceland.com/int/v16n8/htdocs/something-something-something-detroit-994.php?page=1.

Novak, David. 2010. "Cosmopolitanism, Remediation, and the Ghost World of Bollywood." *Cultural Anthropology* 25(1): 40-72.

"On View: Detroit Disassembled, Photographs by Andrew Moore." 2011. *The Architect's Newspaper*, October 19. Accessed April 18, 2012. http://blog.archpaper.com/wordpress/archives/25928.

"Photo-Op: The Ghost City." 2012. *The Wall Street Journal*, January 21. Accessed April 20, 2012. http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204542404577158820224666772.html.

"Quicken Loans Closes on Deal to Buy Chase Tower, Parking Garage in Downtown Detroit." 2011. *MLive*, April 7. Accessed April 16, 2012. http://www.mlive.com/business/detroit/index.ssf/2011/04/quicken_loans_closes_on_deal_t.html.

Radujko, Gabriella. 2011. "Detroit Disassembled @ Queens Museum of Art." *Artcards Review*, September 28. Accessed April 17, 2012. http://artcards.cc/review/disassembled-detroit-queens-museum-of-art/4262/.

Rancière, Jacques. 2007. *The Future of the Image*. Translated by Gregory Elliot. London & New York: Verso.

Reed, Ryan Spencer. 2011. "Detroit Forsaken." *Photo Technique*, March/April.

Rubin, Mike. 2011. "Capturing the Idling of the Motor City." *New York Times*, August 18. Accessed March 23, 2012. http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/21/arts/design/andrew-moores-photographic-take-on-detroit-decay.html?_r=1.

Seelye, Katharine Q. 2011. "Detroit Census Confirms a Desertion Like No Other." *New York Times*, March 22. Accessed April 4, 2012. http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/23/us/23detroit.html.

Smithson, Robert. 1996. "A Tour of the Monuments of Passaic, New Jersey (1967)." In *Robert Smithson: The Collected Writings*, edited by Jack Flam, 68-74.

Soth, Alec, and Mick Brown. 2009. "Requiem for a Dream." *The Telegraph*, July 5. Accessed April 20, 2012. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/northamerica/usa/6206769/Requiem-for-a-dream.html.

St.-Lascaux, David. 2011. "Andrew Moore: *Detroit Disassembled*: Photographs." *The Brooklyn Rail*, October. Accessed March 23, 2012. http://brooklynrail.org/2011/10/artseen/andrew-moore-detroit-disassembled-photographs.

Stafford, Barbara Maria. 2000. "'Illiterate Monuments': The Ruin as Dialectic or Broken Classic." In *Space, Site, Intervention: Situating Installation Art*, edited by Erika Suderburg, 64-83. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Staley, Willy. "What's Really Pornographic? The Point of Documenting Detroit." *The Awl*. September 1, 2011. http://www.theawl.com/2011/09/whats-really-pornographic-the-importance-of-understanding-detroit.

Sugrue, Thomas. 1996. *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Tannenbaum, Barbara, and Mitchell Kahan. 2010. Afterword to *Detroit Disassembled*, by Andrew Moore, 122-123. Akron, OH; Bologna, Italy: Akron Art Museum and Damiani Editore.

Tower, Tim. 2011. "*Detroit Disassembled* by Andrew Moore: The Devastation of a Major American City." The World Socialist Web Site, January 5. Accessed

March 26, 2012. http://www.wsws.org/articles/2011/jan2011/detr-j05.shtml.

Utter, Douglas Max. 2010. "Review: Detroit After Autos." *The Architect's Newspaper*, August 20. Accessed April 18, 2012. http://archpaper.com/news/articles.asp?id=4783.

Zabrodski, Sarah. 2012. "Detroit Disassembled: Photographs by Andrew Moore at the Queens Museum of Art." *Emerging Art Critic*, January 23. Accessed April 17, 2012. http://emergingartcritic.com/?p=766.

Zukin, Sharon. 1991. *Landscapes of Power: From Detroit to Disney World*. Berkeley: University of California Press.